# T

1. Interp: The aff must defend that all constitutionally protected speech in all venues ought not be restricted by public colleges or universities. To clarify, they can’t defend removing a specific restriction on speech.

B. Violation: they defend only professors

C. Semantics decisively negate- almost test and framers intent prove

Lallas 17, Jackson, A DEFENSE OF T-ANY, 2017, http://www.theladi.org/blog/2017/2/9/a-defense-of-t-any

This article will attempt to defend the common negative position on this debate. Unlike other justifications for T – Any, I won’t be focusing much on semantics[1]. I think the semantics issue is trivial on this topic. It’s obvious that any refers to all constitutionally protected speech, so the broader interpretation is most consistent with the wording of the resolution. While I will begin by going over this debate, the bulk of the article will focus on pragmatic arguments justifying a broader interpretation. As a caveat, I think general arguments surrounding spec good / bad, plans good / bad, and other similar issues are much stronger on some topics than others. Given the wide range of LD resolutions all the way from hyper specific to broader than some policy topics, topic-by-topic analysis is important. That’s why this article looks into the debate around T – Any instead of the broader spec or plans debates, and many arguments here won’t apply to different resolutions. I. The Semantics of Any There is a lot of debate about the meaning of the determiner any. In rounds the issue tends to be whether any is used in the universal or existential form[2]. Consider these sentences: (1) Did you debate any debaters? (2) Any debater could win that round. In (1) any seems to function as an existential. If you debated at least one debater, you would answer yes to the question. However, (2) operates as a universal – pick any debater and they should be able to win the round. A good rule of thumb for telling the difference between a universal and existential any is the ‘almost test,’ (See Carlson 1981, and Kadmon and Landman 1993). Almost can only modify universal determiners (Kadmon and Landman 1993). Consider: (3) Did you debate almost any debaters? (4) Almost any debater could win that round. We see that (3) is incoherent, but (4) still makes sense. (4) now has a smaller scope than (2), as some debaters would not be able to win the round. Using the almost test, it’s clear that our current topic is an example of the universal any: (5) Public colleges and universities ought not prohibit almost any constitutionally protected speech. Though awkward, this sentence has a clear meaning. It reads: “With a small amount of exceptions, constitutionally protected speech ought not be prohibited by public colleges and universities.” Since the resolution passes the almost test, we know that it uses any as a universal determiner. This demonstrates that the semantics of the resolution favor a generic reading, as we would intuitively expect. I will note that there is debate about the meaning of a universal any. However, I have not encountered an article advocating for a model allows the affirmative position to be the more accurate reading of the resolution. There is a lot of literature on the semantics of any and some of the articles are 300 + pages long, so it’s possible I missed something. Another semantic justification for the negative position comes from the ‘widening effect’ of any (Kadmon and Landman 1993). Consider this example, slightly modified for clarity from Kadmon and Landman: (6) Owls hunt mice. (7) Any owl hunts mice. Although both sentences are generic, they conclude that (7) rules out exceptions more strongly than (6). (7) applies to more cases than (6) so it is a broader statement. From an intuitive perspective, this happens because the determiner any emphasizes a statement’s generality. Now consider the following sentences: (8) Countries ought to prohibit the production of nuclear power. (9) Countries ought to prohibit any production of nuclear power. (10) In the United States, private ownership of handguns ought to be banned. (11) In the United States, all private ownership of handguns ought to be banned. (12) Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict constitutionally protected speech. (13) Public colleges and universities in the United States ought not restrict any constitutionally protected speech. There are two observations to be made here that support the negative side of T - Any. The first is that (12) and (13) are analogous to the construction of (6) and (7), so the widening effect indicates that (13) applies to a larger quantity. The second is that the use of any seems to be very deliberate. Our past resolutions (8) and (10) were general statements that omitted universal determiners. The current topic does use a universal determiner, but clearly not for a grammatical reason as it could have easily been written as (12). The choice to use (13) deviates from this trend and highlights the fact that any should increase the scope of the topic. The existential interpretation treats any as superfluous and reads (13) in the same way as (12). (9) and (11) help illustrate why this choice is so significant; we read topics with universal determiners differently than the general versions omitting them. Thus, it’s clear that the semantics of the resolution mandate the negative interpretation. Since the focus of the article is about introducing a pragmatic defense of T – Any, I won’t go into reasons why semantics matter for topicality. If you want to learn more about semantics vs pragmatics, Nebel’s “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics” and Overing and Scoggin’s “In Defense of Inclusion” provide great starting points. With semantics out of the way, I’ll now offer some pragmatic arguments in favor of my position.

This outweighs

1. context- Lallas is specific to the resolution by applying the almost test, other definitions just define any in general.
2. Topic lit- Lallas reviews multiple surveys and thus the topic lit as a whole.

2. Limits- Your interp allows a near infinite number of aff’s.

Fire lists 170 different speech codes that infringe on due process student rights alone, meaning there’s at least 170 plans you could get a solvency advocate for right then and there.[[1]](#footnote-1) Even assuming only a third of these are viable, you have justified a caselist with 50 distinct plans, not even counting permutations of plans and non-FIRE, That’s ridiculous because we’ve only had this topic for a couple months, there is no way I could prep that many specific case negs and also prep for other aspects of the resolution and also live a normal life.

Multiple impacts to limits

1. Fairness- this pigeonholes the negative into generics like the Kant NC every single time. This gives the aff a huge prep advantage because they know what the 1NC will be literally every single time. It also means I never get to debate util debate even if it is my best layer.
2. Topic education—the neg ensures every round can be about the topic even if the neg doesn’t have specific prep to the aff’s scenarios.
3. Reciprocity- their interp requires the neg to bifurcate their prep between tons of aff’s while the aff focuses on just one. That means the 1nc will get destroyed by 1ar frontlines in every debate since the aff has had at least 30 times more prep on it. My interp makes sure that research burdens are drawn on reciprocal lines, since both debaters have to prep for all instances of speech.

Now here are some preempts to the 1AR counterinterp on T:

First, topical version of the aff solves: you can read your specific rights as advantages under a whole res aff. Takes out overlimiting- any aff is fair just as an advantage.

Second, the 1AR will argue plan-focus is key to checking back pics, but that argument is wrong:

a. Wrong solution- if PICs are really so abusive it should be easy to win 1ar theory against the PIC. Voting aff means setting a norm where the aff is always pre-emptively abusive, which outweighs all their offense on magnitude.

b. No uniqueness and link turn- Debaters can always be abusive if they want to. Even with plans debaters can read NIBs, skep, word PICs, etc. In fact, against abusive affs debaters are more likely to read abusive strategies because it’s the only thing that links to the 1ac.

Third, the 1AR will provide a counterinterp that they claim solves the neg’s limits claim but those planks are self-serving because every aff debater reading a plan draws a line in the sand that allows their aff but not others. Arbitrary limits lead to infinite regress because every debater uses them to justify their unpredictable interpretation of the aff, but that doesn’t solve the world of neg prep.

D. voter-

1. Fairness is a voter since the ballot asks who the better debater is and you can’t make that decision accurately if the round is unfair.

2. Fairness outweighs education

Education loss is a reversible harm - I can always read up more on topic lit later, or do rebuttal redos to increase clash and critical thinking skills. But an unfair decision is permanent.

3. Drop the debater- Drop the arg is severance on T because it shifts their advocacy to whole res in the 1ar. This is unfair because the 1nc strategy was premised on the AC plantext. If you allow them to shift it punishes me for their abuse.

4. Competing Interps

a) Reasonability begs the question of what’s reasonable, requiring arbitrary intervention for the judge to evaluate the round. Even if you set a brighltine its arbitrary, allowing you to always set a brightline that lets you get away with abuse. Your 1AC brightline proves, *<ARTICULATE WHY>*

b) Reasonability begs the question of their interp. If I win offense, they are unreasonable. So a. even under reasonability the debater with the most offense wins and b. it collapses to competing interps because the debater has to win their interp / counterinterp first.

5. No RVIs

a) RVI’s prevent theory from checking abuse. I wouldn’t want to initiate a theory debate against an abusive case if my opponent could win the theory debate on an RVI. This is especially bad since they knew what they were defending beforehand but I didn’t ensuring a huge prep skew on theory already.

b) Reciprocity-Theory is not a nib- you can go for link turns or impact turns- you can impact turn with fairness for who or link turn with arguments for why I violate or use the voters to generate offense on a new shell. Giving you another way out creates a 2:1 skew.

6. Theory ed is as beneficial as substantive ed- it forces thinking on your feet and heavy technical focus. Outweighs on reversibility- we can read books and lit, but debate is the only place where we can construct our own rules.

7. T outweighs 1AR theory:

a) Non topical affs force me to be abusive because I am debating off my prep and need to compensate for 1AC advantages, means T outweighs because it occurred first and framed any other theory violations;

b) T is the most severe impact because it gives the aff a monopoly on prep;

c. worse case evaluate strength of link….

# 2NR Pragmatics

## 2NR Overview

## AT Solvency Advocate Solves

Omit

## AT Disclosure Solves

1. Omit

## AT You Will Read PICs

1. Omit

## AT Aff Has to Prep Every DA

1. Omit

## AT only spec this group

1. Omit

## AT Stable Advocacy

1. Omit

## AT Side Bias

1. Omit

## AT Depth/Research (redo too long)

1. Omit

## AT Clash/Resolvability

Omit

## AT Quasi-Policy

1. Omit

## AT key to empirics

1. Omit

## AT truth proposition

1. Omit

# 2NR Semantics

## Not offense for the AFF

1. Omit

## Definition Comparison

### Overview

Omit

### AT leslie

Omit

### AT Existential Bare plurals

Omit

## Semantics & Reasonability

1. **Omit**

# 2NR AT Nebel T is racist

Omit

1. Fire Cite: Foundation for Individual Rights in Education. "Case Archive". Retrieved 2008-03-25. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)